

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Best Practices for Community-Engaged Participatory Research with Pacific Islander Communities in the US and USAPI: Protocol for a Scoping Review
AUTHORS	McElfish, Pearl; Ayers, Britni; Purvis, Rachel; Long, Christopher; Sinclair, Ka'imi; Esquivel, Monica; Steelman, Susan

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Linda B Cottler University of Florida Department of Epidemiology USA
REVIEW RETURNED	14-Oct-2017

GENERAL COMMENTS	I found this scoping review to be credible, complete, comprehensive and clearly written. The specific terms used were well described. The protocol will yield much useful information for a specific role of community based participatory work with this racial/ethnic group. The only other comment I would make is that there seems to be no one from the community of racial/ethnic minorities on the paper.
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Elena Wilson La Trobe University, Australia
REVIEW RETURNED	20-Oct-2017

GENERAL COMMENTS	Authors propose a scoping review to examine best practices for conducting CBPR with Pacific Islanders and has the potential to be a useful resource for researchers using the CBPR approach in those communities. I understand CBPR to be unique to the community with which it is undertaken: successful, effective practices and decisions made in one study are not necessarily transferable to other studies as each CBPR partnership is unique. Is the wider purpose of this review to provide guidance for addressing "the profound health disparities in the rapidly growing Pacific Islander population"? If so, it would be useful to clarify how this review might contribute to that goal and whether it might be a presentation of practices and their outcomes rather than the more subjective 'best practices'. Authors might also give consideration to avoiding the potential for an essentialised representation of Pacific Islanders in their undertaking. I believe this scoping review has merit with some attention to the above comments.
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Emily Zimmerman Virginia Commonwealth University, USA
REVIEW RETURNED	26-Oct-2017
GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Since this is presented as the first review to synthesize best practices for community-based participatory research practices with Pacific Islanders, it would be helpful if the authors provided a justification for why the review will begin with publications in 2000.</p> <p>P. 7 lines 11-13, Samoan is listed twice.</p> <p>Will the findings differentiate best practices that are specific to working with native islanders from best practices that are reported in the literature for other population groups, and describe the overlap between them?</p>

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1

Reviewer Name: Linda B Cottler

Institution and Country: University of Florida, Department of Epidemiology, USA

Competing Interests: None declared

Comment: I found this scoping review to be credible, complete, comprehensive and clearly written. The specific terms used were well described. The protocol will yield much useful information for a specific role of community based participatory work with this racial/ethnic group. The only other comment I would make is that there seems to be no one from the community of racial/ethnic minorities on the paper.

Response: Two of the authors on this manuscript are Pacific Islanders, and we have invited a third Pacific Islander researcher has been invited to co-author the review article, but did not have time to participate in the protocol article.

Reviewer: 2

Reviewer Name: Elena Wilson

Institution and Country: La Trobe University, Australia

Competing Interests: None declared

Comment: Authors propose a scoping review to examine best practices for conducting CBPR with Pacific Islanders and has the potential to be a useful resource for researchers using the CBPR approach in those communities.

I understand CBPR to be unique to the community with which it is undertaken: successful, effective practices and decisions made in one study are not necessarily transferable to other studies as each CBPR partnership is unique. Is the wider purpose of this review to provide guidance for addressing "the profound health disparities in the rapidly growing Pacific Islander population"? If so, it would be useful to clarify how this review might contribute to that goal and whether it might be a presentation of practices and their outcomes rather than the more subjective 'best practices'. Authors might also give consideration to avoiding the potential for an essentialised representation of Pacific Islanders in their undertaking. I believe this scoping review has merit with some attention to the above comments.

Response: We have included a discussion on the impact of how a scoping review of this nature will better aid CBPR partnerships to address the health disparities in these populations.

Reviewer: 3

Reviewer Name: Emily Zimmerman

Institution and Country: Virginia Commonwealth University, USA

Competing Interests: None

Comment: Since this is presented as the first review to synthesize best practices for community-based participatory research practices with Pacific Islanders, it would be helpful if the authors provided a justification for why the review will begin with publications in 2000.

Response: In our initial search, there was little to no research on CBPR with Pacific Islander prior to 2000 that met the inclusion criteria. Starting at 2017 will provide 17 years of review which is consistent with many other review articles.

Comment: P. 7 lines 11-13, Samoan is listed twice.

Response: We have removed this duplication.

Comment: Will the findings differentiate best practices that are specific to working with native islanders from best practices that are reported in the literature for other population groups, and describe the overlap between them?

Response: The article will discuss how the findings from this review confirm and/or add to existing literature on best practices in CBPR.

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Emily Zimmerman Virginia Commonwealth University, USA
REVIEW RETURNED	21-Nov-2017
GENERAL COMMENTS	Most comments were adequately addressed.